Jh

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/500,655	02/09/2000	Scott C. Cottrille	777.327US1	2927

26389	7590	01/05/2006

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 October 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>29-31,67-69,101-103 and 105-119</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>29-31,67-69,101-103 and 105-119</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed 10/27/2005 to the original

application filed 02/09/2000.

2.   Claims 29-31, 67-69, 101-103, and 105-119 are currently pending in this application.

Claims 29, 67 and 101 have been amended. Claims 29, 67, and 101 are independent

claims.

Request Continuation for Examination

3.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR

1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been

withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/27/2005 has

been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if
the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would

Claims 29-31, 67-69, 101-103, and 105-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lakritz** (U.S. 6,623,529 – filed 01/1999) in view of **Pei-Chi Wu**, "Transition from national standards to Unicode: Multilingual support in operation systems and programming languages", Software-Practice and Experience", 01/2000, pp. 765-774.

As to claim 29

Lakritz teaches *(col.2, lines 17-27)* a computer-implemented method for generating localized versions *(e.g., provide a document localization)* of a localizable Internet document *(e.g., multilingual Internet Web site)* for delivery to a client *(e.g., delivery to Web site visitor)*, the method comprising:

a.   extracting a localizable portion from the localizable Internet document *(e.g., Documents that need to be translated are extracted from the language and country database; col.10, lines 40-42 and col.11, lines 52-60)* so as to separate the localize portion from no-localizable content of the localizable Internet document *(col.9, lines 44- lines 57 & col.10, lines 40-42);* wherein the localizable portion is translatable according to different languages and/or geographical locations *(e.g., automatically determines the language and country of a Web site visitor ...*

deliver the appropriate localized content contained in one or more

country/language database and/or file-based content in a file system to the

visitor's browser; col.4, lines 3-19/ create localized content for specific

geographic regions or countries; col.6, lines 50-57/ automatically localized for

different languages; col.26, lines 33-35 and Fig.12) so as to form multiple

localizable versions *(e.g., the creation of foreign language versions; col.8, lines*

64-66 and Fig.12, items 1210-1215); and

b.   storing the localized versions of the localizable portion and storing the encoded

versions *(e.g., All documents in that language are placed in the corresponding*

directory; col.17, lines 44-64 and col.25, lines 39-59).

c.   Lakritz, however, does not specifically teach *"converting each localized version*

to a plurality of encoded versions."

d.   Wu teaches converting each localized version to a plurality of encoded versions

(e.g., see the conversion discussion beginning at page 770).

e.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to include the feature from Wu in the system of Lakritz

because it would have provided the capability for improving multilingual support

in operating systems and programming languages without introducing much

complexity.

As to claim 30

a.   Wu teaches extracting string literal from the localizable document; and storing the

string literal as symbols *(pages 767 and 770-772).*

b.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to include the feature from Wu in the system of Lakritz

because it would have provided the capability for improving multilingual support

in operating systems and programming languages without introducing much

complexity.

As to claim 31

a.   Wu teaches the encoded versions represent double-byte character set, Universal

code character set, and 8-bit Unicode Transformation Format versions of the

corresponding localized version *(see the Summary section & pages 766 and 768-*

769).

b.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to include the feature from Wu in the system of Lakritz

because it would have provided the capability for improving multilingual support

in operating systems and programming languages without introducing much

complexity.

As to claim 105

Lakritz teaches the localizable Internet document is an electronic mail document *(see the*

Abstract and col.2, lines 17-27).

As to claim 106

Lakritz teaches the localizable Internet document is a Web page document *(see the*

Abstract and col.3, lines 25-38).

As to claim 107

Lakritz teaches the localizable Internet document is an electronic communication *(see the Abstract and col.2, lines 17-27).*

As to claim 108

Lakritz teaches the electronic communication is electronic mail *(see the Abstract and col.2, lines 17-27).*

As to claim 109

Lakritz teaches the localizable Internet document is a portion of a Web page document *(see the Abstract and col.2, lines 17-27).*

As to claim 67

It is directed to a computer-readable medium for implementing the method of claim 29, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to claims 68-69 & 110-114

They include the same limitations as in claims 30-31 and 105-109, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 101

It is directed to a computer for performing the method of claim 29, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to claims 102-103 and 115-119

They include the same limitations as in claims 30-32 and 105-109, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed on 10/27/2005 have been fully considered, but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant argues in substance that *Lakritz does not converting localized content into a*

plurality of encoded versions (Remarks, page 9).

In response, the newly applied prior art (Wu) is used to teach the limitation as claimed.

Wu teaches converting localized content into a plurality of encoded versions *(e.g., see the*

conversion discussion beginning at page 770).

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

-	Edberge et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,793,381	issued: Aug. 11, 1998
-	Kanungo et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,870,084	issued: Feb. 9, 1999
-	Kadyk	U.S. Patent No. 6,166,666	issued: Dec. 26, 2000
-	Tout	U.S. Patent No. 6,182,148	issued: Jan. 30, 2001
-	Tan et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,314,469	issued: Nov. 6, 2001
-	Atkin et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,492,995	issued: Dec. 10, 2002

-       Stamey et al., "Website Localization", Proceedings of the 17th Annual

International Conference on Computer Documentation, October 1999, ACM, pp. 127-

130.

-       Burns et al., "Opentag and TMX: XML in the Localization Industry", Proceedings

of the 16th Annual International Conference on Computer Documentation", September

1998, pp. 137-142.

-       Caldwell, JT., "Unicode: A Standard International Character Code for

Multilingual Information Processing", Characters and Computers, IOS Press, 1991, pp.

180-191.

-       Apple Computer, Inc., "Programming With The Text Encoding Conversion

Manager", Technical Publication, April 1999, pp. 1-286.

Contact information

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30

pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
1/3/2006